DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 128 HE 013 612

TITLE Cooperative Program in Urban Affairs and Public Services. Final Program Report, February 1978.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. Office of Intergovernmental Science Programs.
PUB DATE Feb 78
GRANT ISP-76-00511-A01; ISR-76-00511
NOTE 31p.; For related document, see HE 013 613.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Role; *Cooperative Planning; Federal Government; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; *Local Government; Outreach Programs; Professional Associations; Public Relations; School Community Programs; *School Community Relationship; Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Public Service

ABSTRACT

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the International City Management Association (ICMA), and other national higher education and public-interest groups met in a series of national and regional meetings in a cooperative planning effort to improve academic public service. On a national level, it was agreed that higher education could be more generally responsive to the needs of local government for training, applied research, and technical assistance. Program efforts at local levels demonstrated that academic leaders had moved beyond the question of "whether" to that of "how?" to enter into effective relationships with local governments. At both levels it was agreed that bridging the "two-cultures" gap between academe and government would stimulate innovations and disseminate ideas about approaches to academic public service. Such a communication bridge would aid in the assessment of public needs and of what colleges and universities might be expected to provide. By the conclusion of the project, the national organization had determined to interact informally and to develop more formal working arrangements on the basis of specific projects that address mutual interests and needs. One such federally funded project demonstrated a network of university-local government collaborative programs on energy conservation. A list of participants is appended, along with two separate papers: "AASCU Institutions and Public Service," by Kurt Smith, and "How Colleges Can Help State Government," by Robert Spencer. (PJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200128

American Association of State Colleges and Universities One Dupont Circle Suite 700 Washington D.C.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NSF

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL PROGRAM REPORT

COOPERATIVE PROGRAM IN URBAN AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC SERVICES

HEW 3612

Submitted to

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
Division of Intergovernmental Science
and Public Technology

February 1978

Allan W. Ostar, Executive Director

The Cooperative Program in Urban Affairs and Public Service was carried out with the support of the National Science Foundation under Grant ISP 76-00511-A01 (September 1976-December 1977). The opinions, findings, and recommendations of this final report do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

This report covers a second phase of activity initiated under the National Science Foundation Grant ISR 76-00511, A Planning Project to Develop a Cooperative Action Program in Urban Affairs and Academic Public Service (report submitted March 1976).

Acknowledgements

The Cooperative Program in Urban Affairs and Public Service relied upon the thoughtful participation of a great many individuals--executive directors of higher education and public official associations and their staff liaison people, senior academic officers of AASCU member colleges and universities, local officials and those who represented them at the regional meetings convened as part of this project. This space does not permit the listing of such a large number; however, their names appear in the Appendix of this report.

Three individuals deserve special thanks for their good counsel throughout the course of the project--Dr. Laurence Rutter, Director of Membership Services Center, International City Management Association; Mr. George Maharay, former Secretary to the Consortium on Education for the Public Service; and, most particularly, Dr. Robert Crawford, Director of Intergovernmental Programs, National Science Foundation.

It is appropriate here to gratefully acknowledge the guidance of President Clark Ahlberg, Wichita State University (Kansas), who during his term as chairman of the urban affairs committee of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities worked with the staff to shape this initiative in university-local government cooperation. He further assured the Program's success by permitting it to call upon the consultative services of an outstanding University staff member, Mr. Frederick Sudermann, whose devotion to this project has proven to be invaluable.

A final word of sincere appreciation must be expressed to Dr. William Fulkerson, Jr., former Associate Executive Director of AASCU, who directed the Program from its inception until nearly the end of this phase of activity. His efforts have made mine all the easier.

Kurt B. Smith
(Project Director)
Assistant Director
Resource Center for Planned Change
American Association for State
Colleges and Universities

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Acknowledgements	i
Introduction	1
Program Objectives	1
Program Activities	2
Management Regional meetings National level cooperation Federal agency liaison Program resources directory	
Conclusion	7
Appendix:	
I. Regional meeting planning group	9
II. Regional meeting participants A. from the state colleges and universities	10
B. representing local public officials	15
III. "Alternatives" article summarizing regional meetings	17
IV. Paper, "How Colleges Can Help State Government," presented at the AASCU Annual Meeting, New Orleans, November 1976	22
V. National organizations that participated in this phase of the Cooperative Program	29

Introduction

This report covers the phase of activity that commenced in fall 1976 with the support of a continuation grant provided by the National Science Foundation. As such, this phase extended the work, begun in 1975, by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) to foster more effective university-local government cooperation in bringing university knowledge resources to bear upon the solution of public problems.

Supported by the National Science Foundation, the initial phase of activity was co-sponsored by AASCU and the International City Management Association (ICMA). Efforts of these two groups brought together national higher education associations, national organizations of public officials, and interested Federal agencies for the purpose of exploring their interest in initiating some form of ongoing national cooperative relationship to foster better university-government working relationships at the local level.

Representatives of these organizations agreed that in general higher education could be more responsive to the needs of local governments for training, applied research, and technical assistance. Further, they agreed that their continued association could be beneficial by providing a forum for developing shared understanding of common needs nationwide and necessary national response to them; by fostering improved working relationships between higher education institutions and local governments; and by stimulating innovation and disseminating ideas about improved approaches to academic public service.

Based upon these conclusions, AASCU sought additional NSF support for a second phase of the Cooperative Program. The second phase, subject of this report, combined the continuation of efforts to strengthen organizational linkages at the national level, with the exploration of problems and potential of academic public service at the local level.

Program Objectives

Efforts undertaken in this phase of activity had three purposes: first, to determine what mechanism would be most appropriate and desirable for ongoing cooperation by the interested national organizations; second, to begin the development of an agenda for action by identifying some opportunities for cooperative projects; third, to involve the appropriate Federal agencies in the development of such projects.

Work objectives were stated more specifically: (1) create a liaison committee of national organization representatives; (2) establish a mechanism to integrate activities of this interorganizational consortium with Federal agencies in addressing critical areas of common concern; (3) conduct four regional meetings and one national meeting on cooperative university-local government programs.

Program Activities

In this section, major activity areas are described. Chart I presents a chronology of key events related to AASCU initiative in the development of cooperative efforts. (Chart I follows on page 3)

Management: The Cooperative Program in Urban Affairs and Public Service functioned within the existing organizational framework of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. The second phase continued under the direction of the Association's Associate Executive Director. The AASCU Resource Center for Planned Change joined the program in this phase; it had principal responsibility for the development of the regional meetings and for general professional and administrative support. When, in February 1977, the Associate Executive Director left the Association, the Assistant Director of the Resource Center assumed the responsibility for direction of the program. Throughout, the program has benefitted from the services of the senior program consultant, drawn from the staff of Wichita State University (Kansas).

Regional meetings: Regional meetings were a means for identifying efforts across the country in training, applied research, and technical assistance. The meetings provided a forum in which university and local government personnel could explore the problems and potential of such efforts.

In September 1976, staff from AASCU, its Resource Center for Planned Change, American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), International City Management Association (ICMA), and several individuals working on university campuses planned a half-day discussion session on academic public service that would be scheduled during each of the Center's four regional Associates Seminars in Washington, D.C., Atlanta, Chicago, and Denver. The series of meetings took place during the months of October and November 1976.

The planners developed a range of interests and issues upon which the objectives and outlines for the Seminar session were based. ICMA and ASPA staff identified and contacted individuals, with government units and on campus, who could represent the needs, interests, and perceptions of public officials. A small group of such representatives was invited for each of the planned seminars. Following the initial contact and agreement to participate, the Resource Center explained in greater detail the purposes and activities of the Associates Seminars and the session to be devoted to academic public service.

About one hundred Center Associates, predominantly the chief academic officers -- academic vice presidents, provosts, deans by title -- attended the Seminars. These individuals were members of the Center network of Associates which at the time numbered approximately 245. Seventeen representatives of public officials joined the Center Associates for the discussions on academic public service.

Chart I: Chronology of Key Events in the Development of AASCU Sponsored Cooperative Initiatives in Urban Affairs and Public Service, September 1976 - November 1977

September 1976

- Planning meeting convened to prepare for regional discussion of academic public service by senior academic officers and local government officials (AASCU, ICMA, ASPA staff and institutional representatives participated in the planning)

October 1976

- Regional meetings conducted in four cities across the country: Washington, D.C.; Atlanta, Georgia; Chicago, Illinois; and Denver, Colorado

- Executive Directors of public official and higher education organizations contacted to ascertain continued interest in participation in Cooperative Program and to request appointment of staff liaison persons

November 1976

- Session of AASCU Annual Meeting devoted to topic: How Colleges Can Help State Government

- Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education briefed on the Cooperative Program

January 1977

- AASCU joins Consortium on Education for the Public Service as representative of national higher education associations

February 1977

- Resource Center task force convened to assist in the development of program resources inventory in academic public service (activity collateral to and not supported by NSF grant)

- Briefing conducted with university research program staff at Department of Housing and Urban Development

- ICMA energy proposal supported by AASCU in briefing of ERDA university research staff/Cooperative Program discussed also

March 1977

- Meeting of Consortium on Education for the Public Service hosted by AASCU at the National Center for Higher Education

April 1977

- Minnesota Government-College Council briefed on Cooperative Program by Secretary of the Consortium on Education for the Public Service

May 1977

- Individual briefings conducted with higher education staff liaison persons

June 1977

- Individual meetings conducted with public official organization liaison personnel
- AASCU convened advisory meeting of higher education associations with the Task Force responsible for planning new Department of Energy institutional and intergovernmental relations area

July 1977

- AASCU Executive Director and Board member met with new HUD Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research

August 1977

- City of Wichita-Wichita State University (Kansas) energy conservation project funded by the U.S. Office of Education; AASCU and ICMA to provide advisory and dissemination assistance

September 1977

- Cooperative Program staff participated in two-day workshop to plan next steps for University of Georgia project -- Assessing Academic Public Service
- Half-day workshop conducted by AASCU Office of Federal Programs; Topic: The College/University as Community Resource; Cooperative Program and ICMA staff served as panelists with campus personnel (activity not supported by NSF)
- Program resources directory - Academic Public Service released by the Resource Center for Planned Change

October 1977

- Short article highlighting AASCU institutions and Cooperative Program efforts appeared in NACo County News
- Cooperative Program staff met with staff of the Association of American Colleges (private liberal arts colleges) to explore mutual interest in participation in the Cooperative Program

November 1977

- AASCU and ICMA announced Wichita program to respective members and selected representatives to serve on project advisory committee

Proceedings of the discussions appeared in the March 1977 issue of "Alternatives," the journal of the Resource Center. Copies of the publication regularly go to the Center Associates, the member presidents and chancellors of AASCU, the associate AASCU member state college and university system heads, other national education associations, and interested individuals. A special mailing of the March 1977 issue provided discussion proceedings to organizations in the Cooperative Program.

National meeting: In November 1976, a general session at the Annual Meeting of AASCU was devoted to the topic of "How Colleges Can Help State Government." The session was developed as a means of bringing the chief executive officers of AASCU institutions into the discussion of improved university-local government working relationships. Dr. Robert Spencer, President of Sangamon State University (Illinois), presented a paper outlining elements which govern relationships between a public college or university and state government.

Development of ongoing national level cooperation: Following the notification of the grant continuation, AASCU contacted the executive directors of organizations that participated in the initial phase in order to ascertain their interest in continuing. They were requested to designate a staff liaison person who would work with the Cooperative Program staff. Of the 13 original higher education and public official groups that participated, ten designated staff liaison people.

At the same time, AASCU, representing the higher education associations, joined the ASPA sponsored Consortium on Education for the Public Service. It was soon recognized that many of the individuals designated as Cooperative Program staff liaison were also representing their organizations to the Consortium. In consideration of this circumstance, it was determined that the Consortium, if willing, might serve the function of the Cooperative Program liaison committee. This arrangement was viewed as capable of providing the needed forum in which ideas could be exchanged and cooperative efforts initiated. More practically, it seemed sensible to save the time required to establish another structure with essentially the same membership.

The Consortium agreed to include Cooperative Program items on its agenda. This arrangement provided a regular forum for the discussion of issues related to academic public service, as such issues arose. Perhaps more important to the eventual success of this phase of the program was the opportunity that membership in the Consortium provided for development of positive working relationships through regular contact with public official groups.

In June 1977 the Project Director and Senior Consultant met individually with the public official organization liaison persons. The purpose of these meetings was to assess interest in continuing in the Cooperative Program beyond expiration of the NSF grant, to explore preferences for ways of interrelating and interacting in the future, and to share any ideas for specific activities that might be considered. Interest was

expressed by all in continuing to work with the higher education community. Preferences were expressed, however, for maintaining an informal, fluid linkage based upon evolving mutual interests. One feature of the preferred style of interrelationship was the desire to develop and design organization participation in cooperative activities on a project-by-project basis.

Federal agency liaison: Throughout this phase of the Cooperative Program contacts have been made with a number of agencies at various levels -- both policy and program -- in order to maintain a level of awareness of our purposes on the part of agency personnel and to explore, as appropriate, interest in support of specific Cooperative Program initiatives.

Three notable exchanges will demonstrate these initiatives.

Department of Energy -- In June 1977 the Cooperative Program brought together representatives of several higher education associations to advise the now Assistant Secretary for Intergovernmental and Institutional Relations on strategies for D.O.E.-university interface.

Department of Housing and Urban Development -- In July 1977, the executive director of AASCU, a member of its board of directors, and the senior consultant to the Cooperative Program met with the Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research in order to re-open the dialogue with that agency on the role that higher education should play in addressing complex, pressing urban problems. The meeting was a culmination of consultations with policy and program staff on the purposes and activities of the Cooperative Program. The meeting represents a first step in a continuing and an expanding dialogue.

Office of Education -- Within the context of the Cooperative Program, Wichita State University and the City of Wichita have developed an energy conservation education demonstration program. The program will help create up to ten demonstration sites -- other university-local government cooperatives -- and develop operational manuals and general information materials. AASCU and ICMA are participating in the project by appointing members to the project advisory committee and participating in dissemination strategies. The project is being supported by the U.S. Office of Education under Title I of the Higher Education Act pertaining to Community Services and Continuing Education.

Program resources directory: The Resource Center for Planned Change conducted, as a collateral project to the NSF-supported activity, an inventory of academic public service programs sponsored by AASCU member institutions. Selected programs submitted to the inventory appear in a Program Resources Directory entitled Academic Public Service. The Directory describes the development and operation of approximately 175 programs deemed significant enough to share by 70 AASCU member institutions. Published in September 1977, the Directory already has wide distribution to

AASCU members, to other higher education institutions, and to their associations. The Center provided complimentary copies of the Directory to the executive directors of the national public official groups and key federal agency personnel. The inventory and Directory served as both a means to assess the academic public service effort by this sizeable group of public higher education institutions and a means to demonstrate that good, workable programs are indeed in operation across the country.

Conclusion

Over a period of months this phase of the Cooperative Program has successfully laid the foundation for future working relationships of higher education and public official groups. Although their interest in the formation of a standing committee or council is not strong, they have clearly expressed interest in continuing to interact, without the encumberances of a special organizational structure or agenda, and to work together on projects that address specific mutual interests and benefits.

The next phase of activity at the national level will face the challenge of maintaining such a fluid linkage. Already some maintenance activities have been identified: for example, the development of an ongoing information exchange linked to membership newsletters. Others will no doubt be identified in time. Therefore, it is clear that AASCU must assume a continuing, active role as convener and broker, linking the higher education and public official communities.

Program activities oriented to efforts at the local level -- regional meetings and program inventory -- have shown that colleges and universities anticipate the growing importance of the role of academic public service in their missions. Academic leaders have moved beyond the questions of whether to those of how to enter into effective working relationships with local governments in order to address the complex, pressing problems of their communities. The how questions encompass concerns with creating a synergy of teaching, research, and public service; with bridging the two-cultures gap between the institutions of higher education and of government; and with developing the necessary fiscal and human resources. The discussion of how within the academic community has encountered another practical concern expressed by public officials concerning what assistance colleges and universities reasonably might be expected to provide. The program inventory/program resources directory developed by AASCU's Resource Center for Planned Change responds to these two questions -- the how and what -- by looking at a sampling of university-local government programs already in operation. A careful analysis of programs, beyond the scope of this phase of NSF-supported activity, should reveal some answers to these questions.

A noteworthy development, not only in light of the questions posed by universities and local governments but also in view of the objectives

shared by the national associations, is the City of Wichita, Kansas-Wichita State University Energy Conservation Program. It serves as a prototype for specific projects that involve local cooperation by universities and governments with participatior by the national associations; it addresses an important public problem and it demonstrates how university resources and municipal resources can be combined in solution of a problem. In projects of this type we may see the convergence of differing orientations toward the question of developing better university-local government working relationships. The concern expressed by the university over how to serve local government links to the concern expressed by the local government over what assistance the university can provide. Furthermore, this particular project has been viewed by a Federal agency as important enough both in substance and in process to warrant funding as a national demonstration project.

The conclusion of NSF-supported effort finds us at a place from which additional initiatives have been or can be undertaken at both the national and local levels. It might be appropriate to characterize this place by borrowing a thought from Sir Winston Churchill to the effect that we have perhaps reached "the end of the beginning."

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I: Regional meeting planning group

Kent G. Alm
Director, Resource Center for Planned Change
AASCU

Robert Barrett
Director, Urban Studies Institute
Mankato State University

Al B. Biscoe
Associate Vice President for Public Affairs
Univeristy of Tennessee

Thomas Bruderle
National Association of Counties

Burton Friedman
College of Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

William M. Fulkerson, Jr.
Associate Executive Director
AASCU

Christopher Gemmell
Coordinator, Program Development
AASCU

George Mahary
American Society for Public Administration

Marina Bühler Miko
Senior Research Associate
Resource Center for Planned Change
AASCU

Lynn Miller
Coordinator, Urban Management Education
International City Management Association

APPENDIX II: Regional meeting participants

A. From the state colleges and universities:

Washington, D.C. -- October 13-15, 1976

Ronald Addison
Assistant Dean and Registrar
Lyndon State College, VT

John Bonas
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Coppin State College, MD

John Cassidy
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Ramapo College of New Jersey

Donald C. Darnton
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mansfield State College, PA

Bernard Gillis
Academic Vice President and Provost
Indiana University of PA

Gordon Goewey
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Trenton State College, NJ

George R. Healy
Vice President for Academic Affairs
College of William and Mary, VA

William Hein
Vice President for Academic Affairs
East Stroudsburg State University, PA

Kenneth Jablon
Vice President and Dean
Frostburg State College, MD

Sheppard Kominars
Vice President for Planning and Program Development
George Mason University, VA

Mary Mobley
Associate Dean
Kutztown State College, PA

John Murray
Vice President and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Wright State University, OH

Glenn Nellis
State University College of Buffalo, NY

Einar A. Olsen
President
University of Maine at Farmington

Bruce Peterson
Vice President for Institutional Planning
Stockton State College, NJ

John Rothermel
Director of Program Development and Research
Roston State College, MA

Herbert Schlossberg
Academic Dean
Shepherd College, WV

Dana Still
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Clarion State College, PA

Frank Stillings
Dean, School of Applied and Fine Arts
Central Michigan University

William Whybrew
Dean
Keene State College, NH

APPENDIX II (Cont'd.)

Richard Wolfe
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Bloomsburg State College, PA

Atlanta, Georgia -- October 18-20, 1976

John R. Bolte
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Florida Technological University

Jerry Boone
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Memphis State University, TN

Billy J. Brown
Dean of Educational Services
McNeese State University, LA

Charles O. Burgess
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Old Dominion University, VA

C. Joseph Carter
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of South Florida

Marvin DeBoer
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Central Arkansas

J. Gray Dinwiddie
Academic Dean
Augusta College, GA

Harvey Durham
Appalachian State University, NC

Nathaniel Fullwood
Assistant Academic Dean for Special Programs
Elizabeth City State University, NC

Linda P. Greer
Assistant to the President for Long-Range Planning
Columbus College, GA

Jack W. Gunn
Dean of the University
Delta State University, MS

Donald Horst
Administrative Intern to the President
Winthrop College, SC

Ralph Lightsey
Assistant to the Vice President
Georgia Southern College

L. A. Logan
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Southern State College, AR

John M. Martin
Vice President for Academic Affairs
West Georgia College

Cecil Patterson
Dean of the Undergraduate School
North Carolina Central University

Richard Prenshaw
Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Southern Mississippi

Wallace S. Prescott
Vice President and Dean of Faculties
Tennessee Technological University

APPENDIX II (Cont'd.)

Nathaniel E. Reed
Provost
Livingston University, AL

Ben H. Romine, Jr.
Director of Planning and University Studies
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Robert E. Stoltz
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Western Carolina University, NC

T. B. Wofford
Vice President
Southeastern Louisiana University

Nancy-Lee Goodwin
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
Florida International University

Chicago, Illinois -- October 25-27, 1976

Ted Andrews
Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs
Governors State University, IL

Clifford Adelman
Director of Academic Project Development
William Paterson College of NJ

Jerry Anderson
Vice Chancellor
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh

Philip Anderson
Dean, Graduate School
University of Wisconsin, River Falls

Joseph Braun
Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs
Northeastern Illinois University

Elwood Ehrle
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Indiana State University at Terre Haute

Wesley L. Face
Vice Chancellor
University of Wisconsin, Stout

Robert Gilmore
Dean of Faculties
Southwest Missouri State University

Claibourne Griffin
Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
The University of Akron, OH

James Horner
Vice President and Provost
Illinois State University

David Johnson
Vice President for Academic Affairs
St. Cloud State University, MN

Leon Keys
Assistant to the President
Ferris State College, MI

Paul C. Larsen
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dickinson State College, ND

APPENDIX II (Cont'd.)

James Magee
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Eastern Michigan University

Curtis L. McCray
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Saginaw Valley College, MI

David Moore
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Radford College, VA

John Morris
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire

Frederick W. Obear
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Oakland University, MI

Howard R. Poole
Director of Instructional Development
Western Michigan University

Margaret Preska
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mankato State University, MN

Robert L. Reid
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Indiana State University, Evansville

Beecham Robinson
Director, Learning Center
University of Wisconsin, Parkside

Edwin G. Speir, Jr.
Vice Chancellor and Dean of Faculties
University of Wisconsin at Whitewater

Denver, Colorado -- November 3-5, 1976

George Ayers
Vice President
Metropolitan State University, MN

Clarence M. Bjork
Dean of Academic Affairs
Western State College of Colorado

Joel A. Davy
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Minot State College, ND

Harold Eickhoff
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Fort Hays Kansas State College

Ed M. Elliott
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Wayne State College, NB

John T. Farr
Assistant to the Provost for Program Review
University of Nebraska-Omaha

James H. Fribourgh
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Donald L. Garrity
Provost
San Francisco State University, CA

APPENDIX II (Cont'd.)

R. Dean Gaudette
Dean of the School of Human Learning and Development
Eastern Washington State College

Henry C. Gold
Dean, School of Business and Industry
Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Ralph J. Harrel
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Southwest Texas State University

DeField T. Holmes
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Fayetteville State University, NC

Wendell L. Jahnke
Assistant to the President
Northern State College, SD

Marvin G. Knittel
Academic Vice President
Kearney State College, NB

Owen Albert Knorr
Director, Office ot Institutional Research and Planning
University of Nevada at Las Vegas

Frank P. Lakin
Vice President for Academic Administration
University of Northern Colorado

Barbara H. Mickey
Associate Vice President
University of Northern Colorado

Richard G. Netzel
Academic Affairs Vice President
Metropolitan State College, CO

Alvin H. Proctor
Academic Vice President
Kansas State College of Pittsburg

Leon J. Richelle
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Portland State University, OR

Howard W. Smith, Jr.
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
North Texas State University

Alan B. Sugg
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Texas A&I University, Corpus Christi

Larry A. Tangeman
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Chadron State College, NB

Elizabeth Schmelling
Instructor, Department of Nursing
East Central University, OK

John P. Turano
Vice President of the College
Adams State College, CO

Herbert H. Weldon
Dean of the Faculty
Mesa College, CO

Shirley A. Rush
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
San Diego State University, CA

Philip S. Wilder, Jr.
Academic Vice President
California State College, Bakersfield

John Breazeale
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Wichita State University

Samuel H. Rankin, Jr.
Dean of Academic Affairs
Valley City State College, ND

APPENDIX II: Regional meeting participants

B. Representing local public officials:

Washington, D.C. -- October 13-15, 1976

Dr. Enid Beaumont
Director, Washington Office
International Personnel Management Association

Mr. Thomas Bruderle
National Association of Counties

Dr. Lynn Miller
International City Management Association
Coordinator, Urban Management Education Program

Don M. Blandin
National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration
Coordinator, Management Education Program

George S. Maharay
American Society for Public Administration
Secretary to the Consortium on Education for the Public Service

Bernard H. Ross
Director, Urban Affairs Program
School of Government and Public Administration
The American University

Atlanta, Georgia -- October 18-20, 1976

Dr. Al B. Biscoe
Associate Vice President for Public Affairs
University of Tennessee

Stephen Collier
Associate Director for Health Programs
Southern Regional Education Board

Martin Toma
Shelby County
Memphis, Tennessee

Dr. Robert Thoeny
Director, Institute of Government Studies and Research
Memphis State University, TN

Mr. Kenneth Vanderslice
City Manager, City of East Point
East Point, GA

APPENDIX II (Cont'd.)

Chicago, Illinois -- October 25-27, 1976

Dr. Philip Kendall
Dean of Public Affairs
Sangamon State University, IL

Mr. Lee Ellis
Vice President of Financial Affairs
Northwestern University, IL

Dr. Michael Goldstein
Associate Vice Chancellor for Urban Affairs
University of Illinois

Denver, Colorado -- November 3-5, 1976

Gail Duree
Colorado Counties, Incorporated
Denver, CO

Robert D. Farley
Executive Director, Denver Regional Council of Governments
Denver, CO

Francis M. Rich, Jr.
Chairman, Department of Political Science
Southwest Texas State University

Lawrence Sprecher
Director, Department of General Services
State of Oregon

John McGwire
Program Officer, Western Projects
National Science Foundation

Nicholas Pijuan
Graduate School of Public Affairs
University of Colorado

APPENDIX III:

"Alternatives" article summarizing regional meetings (from "Alternatives," Volume I, No. 3, March, 1977)

AASCU INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC SERVICE

BY KURT SMITH

An Overview

When, during the Fall '76 seminars, teams of Center Associates were assigned to complete portions of the policy-making statement matrix, there was general agreement that the next decade and a half would bring greater involvement in public affairs through diverse programs and activities in applied research and direct service as well as in extended forms of traditional academic curricula. Clearly, it could be anticipated that the 1980's would see an ever more prominent role for public service in the mission of the state colleges and universities.

It is interesting to note that some significant overall changes were projected by the teams in their efforts to explore the impact of societal trends upon the state colleges and universities: The colleges will be likely to share with governmental agencies the responsibility for the delivery of an ever wider range of citizen services.

The concept of the colleges as a knowledge resource--in the "Knowledge Society"--will require broadening of the definition of clientele to include not only individuals in the community, but private organizations and public agencies as well. Further, the Associates' teams anticipate the college or university to become a leader in the conceptualization process that deals with emerging trends and with the exploration of new avenues toward solving the public's problems. As a result, the Associates foresee less clear-cut lines between what will be "academic" and what will be "public service." (See "Defining Public Service" a little later in this report.)

What is Happening Today?

In fact, some of our campuses today are functioning in modes that anticipate a future role:

. . . the University of Maine at Farmington is operating a statewide health-education resources center. The center includes a unit responsible for supporting cooperative arrangements to bring all available resources within the state to bear upon problems in health education.

. . . Wright State University in Ohio is participating with area industry and key city officials in an Area Progress Council, while the Ohio State Board of Regents is inventorying all institutional resources available to serve public agencies.

. . . Boston State College and all other colleges and universities in the Boston metropolitan area are serving under court mandate as partners with individual school districts and schools in curriculum and support system development.

. . . the University of North Carolina at Charlotte serves as a brokerage unit linking any agency with relevant university expertise.

. . . Ferris State College in Michigan, together with other colleges in its region, has formed a local government service center created to help with practical problems ranging from sewer system design to setting up government charters.

. . . the Library at Augusta College in Georgia is serving as an information resource to a 13-county planning commission.

. . . Florida International University in Miami is operating an Environmental Urban Planning Center that provides research support to local government. FIU also has established a Labor Institute to assist the local and statewide labor movement, as well as a Division of Community Affairs to coordinate consulting services. In addition, the State University System acts as a university-services broker for all agencies in the state.

. . . Memphis State University in Tennessee has created an Institute for Government Studies and Research. The institute's director is currently deeply involved in local government efforts to bring about a major reorganization.

. . . Southeastern Oklahoma State University, under a contractual arrangement, provides the planning staff for the Choctaw Nation.

. . . Metropolitan State College in Denver has developed an extensive community outreach program in which students learn while providing human services.

. . . Southwest Texas State University is developing a public service model for the regional state university.

. . . Portland State University in Oregon has received a mandate from the state legislature to establish a policy studies center for Oregon.

. . . the University of Arkansas at Little Rock is developing a Center for Urban and Governmental Affairs. Among other projects in the preliminary stages of development are an executive training program for cabinet officers and senior administrators in the state government, training of personnel and restructuring county government operations necessitated by a state constitutional amendment, and an analysis of state tax systems in order to recommend some special taxation to support economic development programs.

These initiatives, and others like them, clearly demonstrate movement toward the new institutional roles explored by the seminar teams. Yet, it may be argued that these activities are uncharacteristic of the current levels of involvement of the majority of the state colleges and universities; indeed, they may not be expressive at all of the climate of involvement present at the major portion of the universities in which they take place. George Mahary, who represented the American Society for Public Administration at the Washington seminar, suggested that where collaboration between campus and government has been developed, it is usually between faculty members within the institution and individual officers within the government; there does not appear to be cross-organizational collaboration between the two.

At AASCU, we are concerned about the circumstances that frequently serve to inhibit the types of initiatives listed above and that impair the kind of cross-organizational collaboration that would seem ideal. Thus, the discussion at the Fall seminars focused on the identification and analysis of many of these circumstances.

Some Inhibiting Factors: Do We Know Them and How Do We Deal with Them?

It was universally agreed that perceptions and attitudes held by both university people and by government people serve as barriers to collaboration. For instance, several Associates expressed the feeling that local and state governments still regard AASCU-member institutions located in their jurisdictions as teachers colleges--or worse, as "state normal"--and therefore tend to turn to the land grant and "prestigious" graduate-research universities for assistance with public problems--while at the same time, the community colleges aggressively continue to express their interest in and capabilities for being resources to local government and others in their service areas.

The seminars also brought to light another facet of this problem in collaboration, namely, the problem of two cultures. The problem arises from divergent approaches which grow out of differences in orienta-

tion towards problems and their solutions. The result of this divergence has been characterized by William Pendleton of the Ford Foundation as a set of "attitudes toward each other tinged with dislike, that are based partly in reality and partly in myth."*

Numbers of heads nodded sympathetically when some instances of this type of dual vision were brought out in the open. Center Associates felt that faculty are often discouraged and sometimes outraged by governmental red tape and governmental decision by what they see as political expediency. Associates cited occasions where they had hesitated to take on potentially controversial topics fearing possible political consequences for their institutions should findings or conclusions be in disagreement with or prove embarrassing to those in power. Yet, to public officials, academics frequently appear willing to take on only those public problems which "interest" them intellectually, or will likely produce academically respectable research, showing little regard for the real, pressing needs of the community.

A tendency among academicians which likely contributes to the impasse was described by Center Associate Ed Speir (University of Wisconsin at Whitewater). He called it "postponing perfection" and described a fairly typical attitude: academics may delay divulging results and conclusions until it can be determined with certainty that the findings are completely accurate, valid, and defensible. Yet the government official involved often must get the best information available and act on it within a relatively immediate time frame.

If these attitudes are indeed prevalent, the prospect of making a beginning does not look encouraging. But the seminar participants did agree that any initiative for cooperation must come from the colleges and universities. Indeed, Center Associates who had some experience with this kind of outreach, counseled others to expect an initial mistrust and to be willing to go through--and past--that stage.

*Pendleton, W.C., *University/City Relations Revisited*, (SR/57). New York: Ford Foundation Office of Reports, 1975, p. 9.

The question of deciding what assistance the institutions could offer for more effective results presented another dilemma. At the Denver seminar, Lawrence Sprecher (State of Oregon) cautioned that asking governmental units what they wanted would likely produce more Edsels. He suggested that a better approach might be to look at what governments are buying in the way of organizational and individual capabilities. However, as suggested by Gail Duree, Colorado Counties, Inc., and Frank Rich, Southwest Texas State University, rural counties and small municipalities really need to be educated as to what, in fact, are their real needs.

But it was found that once a need has been identified and a university response implemented, another problem emerges. According to Clay Griffin (University of Akron) when it becomes known the university is providing a particular service, demand for that service escalates and may exceed the institution's capacity to respond. Rising community expectations--unfulfilled--may lead to frustration with the project. The resultant situation simply confirms the originally held perception that the university really is not very effective in helping with community problem solving.

What About Higher Education?

Seminar discussions looked not only at problematic interactions between government and university, but at some of the problems internal to higher education.

The manner in which the flow of funds to institutions is regulated in most states actually was found to act as a disincentive to any significant institutional initiative in public service. Almost without exception, funding appears to be tied to credit hour production; and public-service activity rarely generates credit hours. In addition, it became clear that because in many states institutions are not permitted to keep public-service generated funds, these funds could not be re-invested in other, *new* public-service initiatives. The result: Public service is something that the campus gives away. To compound the frustration, with no adequate funding mechanism available, public-service initiatives are forced to compete with the

established programmatic functions of the university for already scarce resources.

The unrealistic expectation thus becomes that faculty are supposed to take on public-service assignments without additional compensation. Although tenure/promotion policies indicate that consideration is given to public service, it offers little real incentive: it is no secret that research/publication in actuality outweighs public service as a determinant in the review process.

Also discussed was another outcome of this circumstance, that is, the advent of the individual faculty entrepreneur who utilizes his/her university affiliation as a basis for private consulting. The individual may or may not be the best qualified person on campus for the assignment. Thus, when the consultancy is successful there is likely to be no problem; however, when it is not, the university is still involved by association. And once again, the unsatisfactory results serve to confirm community beliefs about the lack of competence on the part of the university to deal with community problems.

Defining Public Service in Terms of the Institutional Mission

Although there was relative agreement about the role of teaching in the mission of the regional state college and university, the role of research was found to be somewhat less clear. While faculty scholarly activity was seen as essential to continued good teaching, the extent to which institutional resources should be devoted to the production of new knowledge was much debated.

The place of public service in the overall mission emerged as a real issue. In a contentious mood, some insisted that these institutions have been engaged in public service in a major way for many years--first as normal schools, later as teachers colleges, and even now--through the development and enrichment of public elementary- and secondary-school teachers and administrators. The Associates agreed that perhaps at the heart of the issue was the fact that for many of the state colleges and universities, rethinking and reinterpretation of institutional missions have not kept pace with the process that has seen them develop from initially single purpose teacher-training institutions to comprehensive, regionally oriented, post-secondary education enterprises.

This thinking led to the immediate difficulty encountered by the Center Associates of agreeing upon what public service is. The following questions, among others, that were the source of differences of opinion and some lively discussion among the Associates illustrate this difficulty: Is it public service if any of the participants--the client(s), student interns working on the project--get academic credit? Can't much of the institution's continuing education program be called public service? What about all the cultural and recreational programs and facilities made available to the members of the community? Also, what about the direct aid to citizens, such as legal advocacy services?

It is probable that attempts at precise classifications of activities will not really be more productive. Certainly, there is no argument that public service, like the other two traditional functions of the university, overlaps and contains elements of activity in the others. Sometime earlier, Dr. Al Biscoe, Vice President for Public Service at the University of Tennessee, had reported that a UT committee spent months on its assignment to develop a definition. The Tennessee Committee had concluded the process with the observation that while *a priori* definitions are difficult, "on a case-by-case basis little difficulty has occurred in distinguishing between what is and what is not public service using as criteria the nature of the client or client group, the content and purpose of the work, and the University channel through which it is delivered."

In this context, it should be noted that problems of definition seem not to have prevented campuses from engaging in "public service." The variety of programs reported by the Associates across the country lent support to the observation made by Center Associate Woody Ehrle (Indiana State Uni-

versity-Terre Haute) during the Chicago seminar, that AASCU-member schools are involved in public-service activity and very much alive to such opportunities. Interestingly, representatives of the public-affairs organizations in Washington expressed surprise at the amount of activity described by Center Associates as already taking place.

What emerged as the critical factor in all this was the institution's ability to create and to maintain a desired balance among the three functions: Center Associates in all seminars discussed this and the related concern that operating programs in teaching, research, and public service be mutually supportive. In summary, the consensus among all participants was that university activity in public service should enhance the teaching and scholarly pursuits of the institution, and that teaching and scholarship have an important contribution to make to the solution of public problems.

Moving Problems into an Action Agenda

John Osman, special consultant to the Resource Center on the future, reminded seminar participants during a discussion of the problems of the public of John Dewey's assertion that each problem contains its own solution. This means simply that the analysis of a problem will suggest goals which must be set along the path to solution, and they, in turn, will suggest strategies that must be implemented to achieve those goals.

It would doubtlessly be beneficial to all concerned if the problems that surfaced in the Associates' discussions across the country would be subjected to such a process of analysis, goal setting, and strategy building. Viewed in this light, problems would become the elements of an agenda for action. Clearly, some items should be placed on the local institutional and/or governmental agenda while others may be best addressed at state or national levels. Still others will require concerted action at all levels. It is in such an effort to facilitate and coordinate the development of an action agenda and subsequent individual and collaborative efforts by campuses and governments that AASCU and the International City Management Association have initiated a long-term project. The AASCU-ICMA Cooperative Project in Urban Affairs and Public Service is described elsewhere in this issue of *Alternatives*.

For its continuing part, the Resource Center will undertake in the coming months the systematic development of a program resource in academic public service. With the collaboration of our Center Associates, we will again inventory operating programs and activities on AASCU-member campuses, such as those mentioned earlier. We will attempt to identify those policies and procedures now in effect that encourage institutions and members of their faculties to become involved in public-service activities. In addition, we will look for institutional mission statements that articulate the role of public service in relation to the overall purpose and to the other major functions of the institution.

APPENDIX IV: Paper presented at AASCU Annual Meeting in New Orleans, November 1976

X HOW COLLEGES CAN HELP STATE GOVERNMENT

Robert Spencer
President
Sangamon State University, Illinois

In 1855 Frederick Barnard complained to his fellow educators that too many colleges were located in secluded rural areas rather than in the cities and towns of America. "Instead of being placed in the midst of any community," Barnard said, "even that of a small country village, they are situated at some moderate distance from such a spot sufficient to be measured by a walk of perhaps half an hour." Bernard observed further, "there is a common design to all this [the location of colleges out of the city and town], and it is clearly traceable to a fear of the dangerous temptations which are presumed to lie in wait for youth wherever human beings are gathered together in society." Barnard noted that these temptations are supposedly greater in large towns and are not even absent from small towns and villages. Therefore small towns and villages are in like manner taboo. Disagreeing with this viewpoint, Barnard went on to say that the moral temptations of the cities and towns were no less that those of the cloistered life in the country. He believed, moreover, that there was less dissipation in those colleges in cities which had no dormitories than is often heard about in those country institutions where compulsory residence in college buildings is a feature of the system. Barnard was later associated with Columbia University in the city of New York and the women's college there which bears his name.

All of this is by way of noting that Sangamon State University is located on 745 acres of good prairie land 30 minutes walk from the edge of Springfield, Illinois, a setting which should ensure the virtue of youth who study with us. Springfield, however, is also the capitol of one of the nation's great states, a state which many believe to be run by the mayor of Chicago more than by the citizens who grow the corn and soybeans, who turn out the manufacturers, or who study in the great colleges and universities of the state.

Sangamon State also has a rented facility in a historical hotel building midway between the State House and the city and county buildings in downtown Springfield, a facility we call the Capitol Campus. It is here that we educate a lot of citizens and public servants right in the heart of sinful Babylon. One might wonder, therefore, how we can respond to the charge given us by this meeting: How can state colleges work more closely with state government if, as many believe, association with state government, like a college located in the city, is inherently corrupting?

In my judgment there are five elements which govern relationships between a public college or university and state government.

The first element is *location*. With all the risks which close associations entail, there must be convenient geographical access between government and the university or college. One hundred years ago, so the story goes, a decision was made in the General Assembly on the location of the newly chartered land-grant institution of Illinois. A settlement was made, we are told. If Kankakee got the state hospital, Joliette would get the prison, Urbana would get the new university, and Springfield would get the state fair. Because of that decision, Urbana was not the site of the kind of remarkable development of the public university early in this century combining teaching, research, and an enormous outreach of public service which we associate with Madison and the Wisconsin idea in higher education. This is not to say that the Uni-

versity of Illinois did not grow into one of the nation's most distinguished land-grant institutions. It did. But the history of the state and local government in Illinois might have been different had the farmers not won out in the decision to locate the new university close to the center of the state's agricultural wealth rather than at the seat of government.

The second element is *institutional mission.* When the master planners of higher education designated Springfield as the site of one of two new upper level universities, they were not simply satisfying the interests of enlightened citizens and boosters of central Illinois. They were, instead, consciously assigning the university a task, that of relating to the government.

Governor Richard B. Oglivie said it well at the ground breaking for SSU's Interim Campus facilities in May 1970. "The institution which we launch together here today will play a very special role in this commitment to better understanding, for it is mandated to become the public affairs university of Illinois. Sangamon State University will educate young people for public service, and serve as a continuing source of ideas and research required to operate the great government which is centered here. The continuing cross-fertilization of ideas and experiences between this campus and the offices of government will be useful to both participants and serve the common interests of the public for whom we all labor. You will bring the academy to the capitol. Perhaps the most exciting aspect of the partnership we will develop here is the mandate to bring the profession of public service into the life of the university student."

In addition to its location and mission emphasizing the liberal arts teaching and the education of career professionals, the new university was given a special and legitimatizing role as the public affairs university of Illinois, a mandate also tied down in the master plan under which it was created and funded.

In these latter days of educational accountability and more restrictive program planning, one is lucky indeed to have a mission as broad and challenging as the one SSU was given in the early 1970s.

The third element is *the academic reward system and philosophy of teaching.* Ours is an upper level and graduate institution designed to provide capstone and baccalaureate programs for the community college graduate and transfer student as well as graduate study at the master's level. An important aspect of this commitment has been an emphasis upon teaching and meeting community and student needs rather than research centered upon the external professional interests of the faculty. From the start we have avoided the publish or perish syndrome in favor of an emphasis upon teaching, public affairs, and service to the community. This does not mean the university takes a stance against research and the scholarly life as such, only that our reward system does not make superstars of those that do research and publish at the expense of those who teach well.

The fourth element is *the deliberate recruitment of faculty skilled in and sensitive to the institution's mission to public affairs.* Our largest graduate program is public administration. We also have a graduate program in public affairs reporting, which takes liberal arts or journalism graduates and gives them a year of study in their chosen public or policy area and a six-months

apprenticeship with a newspaper, wire service, or broadcast media correspondent in the State House press room. Our faculty is also particularly strong in the so-called helping professions, which relate to agencies of state government such as child, family, and community services; the social justice professions; human development counseling; and clinical psychology. Since 1973 we have had a senior administrator—a Dean of Public Affairs—assigned to the development and management of major portions of the university's public affairs mission.

Through graduate internships, teaching, and faculty involvement with selected state and federal grants, the universities three public affairs centers provide concrete expression of the mission to public affairs. These centers deal with executive programs and policy studies, with the needs of middle-sized cities, and with the legislature. In staffing these three public affairs activities of the university, faculty are asked to maintain their usual scholarly and teaching competencies and also to develop, where needed, an increasing understanding of public policies in their field as well as the skills which could contribute to the improvement of professional and bureaucratic performance in state and local government and voluntary agencies.

In 1976 the faculty senate approved, and we have implemented, a series of internal joint appointments between our public affairs centers and regular academic disciplines. These are intended to foster faculty commitment and accountability to the public affairs aspect of the universitys mission. All persons holding joint appointments within the university are subject to evaluation by their deans, their peers, and by students or client agency personnel in both areas of appointment, so that accountability to both the professional and the university communities is maintained.

With the help of a grant from the Ford Foundation in early 1975, Sangamon State inaugurated an unusual journal of public policy, *Illinois Issues*. This monthly publication has a small editorial staff of professionals who hold academic appointments and teach as well as operate the journal. *Illinois Issues* is both a forum for review of public policy affecting state government and a journal of record for official appointments, court decisions, and major legislative actions including key role call votes in the manner of the *Congressional Quarterly* in Washington, D.C. Obviously *Illinois Issues*, like all of our other public affairs activities, is and must continue to be scrupulously bi- or nonpartisan and highly professional, even though its articles touch upon heated controversies of current and longstanding interest in the state. It is also well-written, displays a spirited style in reporting controversial topics, includes generous use of the political cartoon and is judiciously balanced politically. We are pleased that *Illinois Issues* is gaining in circulation to include state and local government officials throughout Illinois, many corporate labor and lobby subscribers, the working press, and an increasing number of school and college faculty and libraries. Last summer we published our first *Illinois Issues Annual* of public policy articles affecting the state of Illinois. It is intended to be used as a supplemental text in secondary school and college classes in public policy and state and local government.

The fifth element is *the curriculum*. This term includes both course work and off-campus learning experiences. Being an upper level institution, SSU